

AIPAC,

Washington, DC, October 16, 2000.

Hon. JON L. KYL,
U.S. Senate, Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KYL: On behalf of AIPAC, we are writing to express our appreciation for your introduction of the Counterterrorism Act of 2000. This legislation takes a number of important steps to address the growing problem of terrorism in our country and abroad.

This bipartisan measure adopts many of the key recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorism, particularly with respect to long-term research and development efforts and methods of improving controls over biological pathogens. We believe this legislation will encourage cooperation among states like the United States and Israel that have worked so closely in fighting the scourge of terrorism. Of course, we also endorse the legislation's intent that Iran and Syria should remain on the list of states that sponsor terrorism until they cease their support for terrorist actions.

Thank you again for your leadership, and please let us know if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

HOWARD KOHR,
Executive Director.
MARVIN FEUER,
*Director of Defense &
Strategic Issues.*

ZIONIST ORGANIZATION
OF AMERICA,

New York, NY, October 11, 2000.

Senator JON KYL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KYL: On behalf of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), which is the oldest and one of the largest Zionist organizations in the United States, I am writing to express the ZOA's enthusiastic support for S. 2507, the Counterterrorism Act of 2000.

This vital legislation will ensure that our country takes swift and effective action to impede the ability of terrorist groups to receive funding, acquire technology for use as weapons, and recruit new members. We have all seen, in recent years, the kind of devastation that terrorist groups can wreak. Our government must do everything possible to combat terrorist groups—and S. 2507 will mandate specific and important steps that will play a crucial role in the fight against terrorism.

We are also pleased to note that the S. 2507 urges that Syria be kept on the U.S. list of terror-sponsoring states until it takes concrete anti-terror steps, such as shutting down terrorist training camps and prohibiting the transfer of weapons to terrorists through Syrian-controlled territory. The legislation also appropriately urges that Iran be kept on the list of terror-sponsors until there is concrete, indisputable evidence that Iran has changed its ways and forsaken terrorism. In the absence of such actions, governments such as those in Syria and Iran must be treated as the rogue regimes which they are.

With gratitude for your leadership role in this effort,

Sincerely,

MORTON A. KLEIN,
National President,
Zionist Organization of America.

ADL,

New York, NY, October 12, 2000.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: We welcome your leadership in introducing legislation to codify several important proposals of the bipartisan National Commission on Terrorism. As an organization committed to monitoring hate groups while safeguarding civil liberties, we support the bill's tough, constitutional approach to investigating and prosecuting terrorist crimes.

The bill's mechanism for allowing classified evidence to be used within a sound due process a framework represents the kind of balanced approach which would prevent the improper treatment of individuals, while allowing the government to protect sources. The legislation would also implement useful steps to prevent the US from being used as a fundraising base for terrorism.

It is well established that the government has the constitutional right—and the duty—to keep our nation from being used as a base for terrorist activity. The legislation you have crafted makes vital improvements in our nation's capability to investigate, deter, and prevent terrorism.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. BERKOWITZ,
National Chairman.
ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN,
National Director.

AJCONGRESS WELCOMES LEGISLATION RESPONDING TO THREAT OF BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL ATTACKS BY TERRORISTS; CALLS MEASURE 'A BEGINNING PLAN' TO DEAL WITH THE DANGER

American Jewish Congress Executive Director Phil Baum issued the following statement today following the decision by Senators Jon Kyl and Dianne Feinstein to introduce legislation responding to the recent report of the National Commission on Terrorism:

The danger not only to this country but to all of civil society from the threat of biological and chemical weapons is becoming ever more real and apparent. For some time now, commentators have been warning of the growing risk of terrorist attacks with these weapons unless effective counter measures are quickly put in place.

Those most expert and familiar with these matters warn that the question is not whether there will be an attack, but when.

A sobering report released recently by the National Commission on Terrorism has documented these concerns and has begun the process of alerting Americans to the danger we face and the steps that can be taken to meet that threat.

Until now, little has been done concretely to implement the Commission's report. Fortunately, there are now plans in the Senate to attach as an amendment to the fiscal 2001 Intelligence Authorization Act a measure which is attempting to respond to this challenge. Introduced by Senators Jon Kyl (R-Ariz) and Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif), the legislation lays out at least a beginning plan for dealing with these problems.

The bill for the first time would impose rigorous restrictions on procedures used in research labs handling pathogens; calls for presidential leadership in the development of new technologies to counter terrorist attacks; limits the capacity of terrorist groups to raise funds in this country—which is often done under the guise of raising funds for social programs; and mandates the CIA and the

FBI to report on the continuing effectiveness of anti-terrorist measures currently in place.

One provision of the bill—authorizing the FBI to share foreign intelligence information obtained from domestic wiretaps with the CIA and other intelligence agencies—has quite properly met with criticism has consequently has been dropped by Senator Kyl. We are convinced that an effective fight against the new terrorist threat can be waged without violating Constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties—protections which must remain our first priority.

As the American people begin to focus on the dangers of chemical and biological terrorism, two equally unacceptable dangers present themselves: that we remain indifferent to the threat, or that we overreact, at the expense of our civil liberties. Neither is acceptable. A measured response is necessary, and the Kyl-Feinstein bill begins that process.

The legislation presents the Senate with the opportunity to move the American people off dead center and to address the danger in a composed and rational manner, without endangering American freedoms or our country's sense of confidence in its future. The new legislation rests on the premise that the future can be best assured by a realistic address to the dangers we confront.

New technologies have been a blessing for this generation. In the hands of terrorists, they become a curse for all generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Arizona in requesting the business of the Senate be allowed to go forward. We have seen many filibusters all year. That is what has gotten us into this situation where we are past October 1 and still working on the budget.

I think we ought to be doing the business of the Senate. My predecessor, Alan Simpson, who had this seat in the Senate, said several times, an accusation that isn't answered is an accusation accepted. There are a couple of things I have to clear up from this morning.

First, we did all this work on a balanced budget without the balanced budget constitutional amendment. Yes, we did. But the debate on the balanced budget constitutional amendment is what made the people of America rise up and tell every single one of their representatives that they wanted the budget of this country balanced. And it was the heat the people of this country put on the Congress that led Members to balance the budget. That wouldn't have happened without the debate on the balanced budget.

That is the reason we have what is being referred to as a "surplus" today. It isn't a surplus. It is tax overcharge. We have collected more from the people than we had planned to spend. We ought to refer to it as that.

I could not begin to cover all of the accusations that were misaccusations. Another real important one I have to

cover is the Reaganomics attack. Yes, giving the money back to the people, as Reagan suggested, resulted in a 30-percent increase in revenue to this country. So why do we have such a big deficit? Because people spent it. We cannot spend more than we take in. It is a pretty basic principle of economics. Reaganomics increased revenue.

The other side, who was in control of the Congress at that time, outspent what he was able to bring in by increasing business in this country. The balanced budget amendment increased the economy of this Nation. Everybody agrees balancing the budget has done that. If we get back to a position where it isn't balanced, people will lose confidence in the economy, and we will be back where we started, with ever-increasing deficits, particularly if we dramatically increase spending each year.

I notice the Secretary of the Treasury took an unusual approach yesterday and got into the debate on Social Security.

The Social Security issue does come down to: Whom do you trust? Every year that I have been here, there has been a promise that there will be Social Security reform. I went to a White House conference. I have to say it was one of the best planned, best organized, and best done conferences I have ever seen. One of the reasons was that Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, were invited to be a part of it. When it finished, there was a special part for everybody from the House and Senate to participate in—again, Republicans and Democrats. We sat down with the President and we agreed there needed to be Social Security reform and that reform had to have the fingerprint of everybody on it, that it could not be used as a Social Security scare.

We have saved bill No. 1 for the President's Social Security reform. Every year that I have been here, the President in his State of the Union speech has said: The most important thing for this country is to solve the Social Security problem. We saved bill No. 1 for him. We never got a solution.

The President of the Senate, who is the Vice President of the United States, has been a part of these efforts. He says he has delivered on all his promises. That is a promise that was made. That is a promise that has not been kept. Social Security has not been reformed.

There has been another effort involved in this, too, and that has been a bipartisan commission—again, Republicans and Democrats sitting down to talk about how to save Social Security. They came up with a plan. They had to have a supermajority to have that plan actually presented to us, and the President's nominees to that committee were the ones who objected and made it one vote short of being a request that could be presented to us. Again, a bi-

partisan solution. That bipartisan solution is what you are hearing Governor Bush talk about. It is something that has been presented in a number of plans here in the Senate, but it needs the endorsement of both Republicans and Democrats, and the elimination of a veto threat at the Presidential level, to be able to solve that problem.

Why do we need to solve it? You have heard how far we extended it and how we are getting extra money into the Social Security trust fund. The money in the Social Security trust fund is IOUs, T-bills. Now we are using the Social Security surplus to pay down the private debt for the United States. Do you know what that does? That lets us spend more money. When we have private debt out there, we pay the interest on a regular basis. When we spend Social Security surplus to pay down the national debt, the private part of the national debt, we increase the Social Security debt and we just put in IOUs to pay the interest.

Why is that important? Sometime the debt will come due. You hear a lot of different numbers about when the debt comes due: 2013 is the magic time when the baby boomers move into the group of recipients of Social Security and start jerking out enormous amounts of money from Social Security—2013. They say Social Security is secure until 2037. That is until the last dime is drawn. It will not work that way. Here is why it will not. In 2025, the ones of us who are here—with the exception of maybe one or two—will not be here. There will be a different generation that will be in the Senate and in the Congress. These will be people who have paid into Social Security their whole life and will realize they will not get a dime out of it.

Here is another little problem. When it comes appropriations time, all they are going to do is decide how big the check for interest is going to be, because the national debt will be so huge at that time that we will not build a road, we will not do anything for the military, we will not do anything for education—we will pay interest. How excited do you think the people of this country are going to be to just be paying interest on a debt from the last century and to have no benefit coming their way? I suggest there could be a revolution in this country, an end to Social Security. Future generations may not feel the same need to take care of their parents and other elderly in the country because they themselves are not going to get any benefit. It is not going to be there to take care of them. So it needs to be solved now.

We are also talking about prescription drugs. This is a very complicated issue. There are at least six plans out there, any one of which could provide prescription drug coverage for seniors. It is something in which we are all interested. It is something that needs to

be done. We need to be sure that every person in this country can get the prescription drugs they need, and we need to be sure every person in this country doesn't have to make a choice between food or their prescription drugs. There have been two plans proposed. They are quite different.

One of the things I like to use is this chart. I think it lends a little validity to the decisions between the two principal plans. One is provided by Governor Bush, one is provided by Vice President GORE. Those are the two main ones. I have to tell you, the biggest difference between the two is that Governor Bush's plan provides for choice, your choice. Vice President GORE's plan calls for a national plan. The decisions will be made in Washington. You will not have the flexibility.

Since we are talking about how some of Mr. GORE's drug proposals work, I suggest they lack a little sincerity and are going to make life much harder for working Americans. Here are some thoughts on the Medicare prescription drug plan. This is the biggest secret out there. Mr. GORE's plan would cover 2.6 million fewer low-income Americans than the plan offered by Governor Bush and introduced in the Senate by Republicans. That is because Mr. GORE's plan offers low-income subsidies only up to 150 percent of poverty, while Mr. Bush's plan would help seniors up to 175 percent of poverty.

Mr. GORE's plan would not even become effective until 2002. On top of that, Mr. GORE's plan would also displace the coverage that 70 percent of the current Medicare recipients already have. For those seniors whose employer offered a retirement benefit, there is now no incentive for the company to continue that coverage, leaving the senior with no option but the HCFA-run program. For all the stock Mr. GORE puts into the agenda, and the advice of the AMA, he apparently has not been concerned by their assertion that the HCFA—that is, this national organization that will run his prescription drug plan—is the IRS of the new millennium. I, for one, do not see the sincerity in putting more people on the *Titanic*. As my friend from Texas often says about putting people on programs under the care of HCFA, it would be a disaster.

If Mr. GORE had sincere concerns about the health and welfare of seniors, he would focus on real solutions that stabilize the Medicare program, offer seniors comprehensive health care, and enable seniors to select coverage, including prescriptions, that meets their needs and budgets. That is a commitment Governor Bush has already made. Governor Bush would provide immediate drug coverage for those seniors who right now cannot afford it. He doesn't cross his fingers and take his chances with HCFA. Instead, he builds

on the existing drug assistance programs in the States.

Here are a few statistics about the immediate impact of the proposal. Half of women beneficiaries who are currently without coverage would gain immediate coverage. Almost three-fourths of the minority seniors currently without coverage would gain immediate coverage. And the most frail of our seniors, those over 80 years old, would improve their access under the Bush plan.

Another important part of the Bush proposal is that States will not be restricted from offering low-income subsidies above 175 percent of poverty. Under the Gore plan, there is no option for States to pool funds and ease the expense of drug coverage for even more seniors.

Why is this chart important? This chart was done by the Washington Post. People who understand newspapers in this country understand what the Washington Post does will not be favorable to Governor Bush. They have a tendency to be favorable to the other side. So when they do a chart, a person ought to pay a little bit of attention to it. This is from the article that came with the chart:

Bush details Medicare plan, September 5: Texas Governor George Bush today proposed spending \$198 billion to enhance Medicare over the next 10 years, including covering the full cost of prescription drugs for seniors with low incomes.

Bush's plan was modeled on a bipartisan proposal by Senator John Breaux, Democrat from Louisiana, and Senator Bill Frist, Republican from Tennessee.

This is the commission I was talking about.

Bush's plan proposes "fully subsidizing people with incomes less than 135 percent of the poverty level and creating a sliding scale for people with slightly more money. But Gore would stop the sliding scale at 150 percent of the poverty level, while Bush would extend it to 175 percent.

As I mentioned, a lot of States like that flexibility. A newspaper that normally would not give good reviews, gives a good review. One problem is the cost over the next 10 years would be \$198 billion. The chart they did comparing the two shows \$158 billion. They were charging him with \$40 billion more in costs than what their chart actually shows.

I hope people will pay some attention to the comparisons. I ask unanimous consent that the chart be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 2000]

Bush	Gore
PREMIUMS	
25 percent of health plans' monthly charge.	\$25 per month starting in 2002, increasing to \$44 by 2008.
COPAYMENT FOR EACH PRESCRIPTION	
Not spelled out. Would be determined by individual plan.	Government would pay 50 percent up to maximum of \$2,000 when the program starts, increasing to \$5,000 by 2008.

Bush	Gore
COVERAGE FOR CATASTROPHIC EXPENSES	
Government pays all costs above \$6,000 per year.	Government pays all costs above \$4,000 per year.
DEDUCTIBLE	
Not spelled out. Would be determined by individual health plan.	None.
HELP FOR LOW-INCOME ELDERLY	
Pays premiums and all other costs for individuals with incomes less than 135 percent of the poverty line—that is, \$11,300 or couples with incomes less than \$15,200. Partial subsidies for people with incomes up to 175 percent of the poverty level.	Same, but partial subsidies available for people with incomes up to 150 percent of the poverty level.
WHEN BENEFITS WOULD START	
Help for low-income people and catastrophic coverage would be administered by states, starting next year. Premium subsidies for other people and broader Medicare reforms to make the program rely more heavily on private HMOs would start in 2004.	2002.
COST	
\$158 billion by 2010	\$253 billion by 2010.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the comparison shows pretty conclusively that you get more benefits under the \$158 billion plan than you do under the \$253 billion plan. The \$158 billion plan goes into effect right away. The other one does not go into effect until 2002, and people have to pay, under the Democrat plan, \$600 whether they get any benefits or not. It is my understanding the \$600 has been subtracted from the \$253 billion to make that cost a little bit lower. So it is a another tax for a proposal that provides for Federal control as opposed to your control.

HCFA versus your decisions: Talk to your doctors about HCFA and how it participates and interacts with them. Talk to them about the crisis that HCFA has already caused in this Nation in medical care and ask yourself: Do I want to give them the added burden of a prescription drug plan and only give myself one option? That is what we are looking at here.

I hope you will do some comparisons and see the difference and concentrate on this bipartisan solution to providing prescription drugs. The one thing about the Governor from Texas with which I have really been impressed has been his ability and effort to work with both sides in the Texas Legislature. I used to be in the Wyoming Legislature. I know how important it is for people to work together. It is a little different atmosphere than we have in Washington.

How did Governor Bush do that when he moved in and had a Democrat legislature? He sat down with them one on one, face to face, and talked to them about his priorities and their priorities, and they worked together. What excites me is following the history of Presidents, they tend to repeat what they have done successfully before, and I am really excited about that because I see a Governor coming to Washington and sitting down with both sides, one on one, face to face—a long process; there are 535 of us, but it is doable. That is what is needed in Washington:

more effort across the aisle, effort like the Medicare Commission that has provided a solution for prescription drugs that can be done. I thank the Chair and yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining under morning business on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to use those 6 minutes to sum up.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, when I finished speaking, the Senator from Arizona came to the floor and said it is unseemly that we would be discussing the Presidential race. The race has been discussed by Senators on both sides of the aisle, as it should be. There is no more important decision to be made by the American people than the choice of the President of the United States, and that choice will determine what this body considers for the next 4 years.

Frankly, we ought to reflect on what has happened with this Republican-led Congress. If you take a look at the fact that we are approaching the Halloween holiday, in that spirit we might consider the fact that Congress has become "Sleepy Hollow," the final resting place for priorities of American families.

Take a look at the list of things that have been offered by the Democratic side but have not been acted upon by the Republican side: A real Patients' Bill of Rights. When you go to a doctor, who should make the decision; a doctor or insurance company clerk? That is an easy choice for me. I want the doctor to make the call. When we tried to pass that bill in the Senate, the Republicans defeated us.

Prescription drug coverage under Medicare: Not one of these convoluted schemes we just heard described that would somehow give prescription drugs to the States for 4 years, take it back, give it to the insurance companies—we know how it should work. Medicare has been on the books for 35 years. It is proven. It is universal.

Frankly, we think all seniors and disabled in that category should be able to make the choice themselves, voluntarily, whether or not they want the benefit under Medicare. The Republicans do not care for Medicare. They called it socialized medicine when the Democrats proposed it and, frankly, they are still criticizing it, doing little to help that system.

Most Americans know how valuable Medicare has been to their families. We think a prescription drug benefit under Medicare should be the law. The Republicans and pharmaceutical interests have stopped us.